

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/086,897

Applicant(s)

YOSHIDA, TOMOYUKI

Examiner

Charlotte M. Baker

Art Unit

2625

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Charlotte M. Baker.

(3) Ron Rudder.

(2) Kimberly Williams.

(4) Yuki Ito.

Date of Interview: _____.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: Reference color patches (Red, Blue, and Green circles) shown as an example.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 8, 9 and 16.


Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


KIMBERLY WILLIAMS
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Rudder and Mr. Ito presented an example of a sheet containing reference color patches (Red, Blue and Green circles). Applicant's invention is using the same reference color patches for both the first and second scans. In the Examiner's view, a distinction in the claim language needs to show that the reference color patches in the first and second scans are the same in order to overcome the current prior art of record. Applicant will file a formal response and Examiner will reconsider based upon that response.